

Fulbright Challenges Goldwater's Answers

By Jack Bell,
Associated Press

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) yesterday challenged Sen. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) to spell out just how the West should achieve "total victory" over international communism.

Fulbright, who heads the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said Goldwater has picked a "stirring" term but a confusing and perhaps dangerous one in the complicated world.

Fulbright's talk in the Senate was in answer to one made there by Goldwater on July 12. That, in turn, was an answer to a June 29 Fulbright speech. Goldwater described President

Kennedy's foreign policy as "weak-kneed" and called for stronger actions and a dedication to "total victory."

The Foreign Relations Committee Chairman asked Goldwater to explain how "total victory" would be achieved over Russia and her Communist allies.

"Is it to be won by nuclear war—a war which at the very least would cost the lives of tens of millions of people on both sides, devastate most or all of our great cities, and mutilate or utterly destroy civilization which has been built over thousands of years?" Fulbright asked.

"Or can 'total victory' be won without war—by some brilliant stroke of diplomacy or by arguments of such compelling logic that the Communists will acknowledge the error of their ways and abandon their grand imperialistic design?"

Fulbright noted that Goldwater had said that the "periphery of freedom" is growing steadily smaller in direct ratio to our failure to act from strength.

"What would a policy of 'strength' involve?" The Arkansas Senator asked. "Does it mean a military invasion of Cuba which would destroy the Castro dictatorship but which would also alienate the rest of Latin America and necessitate the stationing of marines in Cuba to protect an American-imposed regime against Fidelista rebels and guerrillas?"

"Does it mean the commitment of American forces to interminable guerrilla warfare in the jungles of Laos, a war in which all the advantages of geography would be on the side of the Communists?"

Even more perplexing than the question of how to win a "total victory" is the problem of what we would do with it once it was won. Would we undertake the permanent occupation of China and launch a series of attacks to "re-educate" the Chinese people in the ways of democracy?

Question of World Opinion

Fulbright disagreed with Goldwater's contention that world opinion "is an area of official concern which has no reason for existing."

"World opinion is eminently worth counting—because the hopes of millions of people for world order and for economic and social reform are our hopes as well," Fulbright said. "Where world opinion seems to us to be feeble or ill-informed, our proper task is to seek to develop and inform it, not to dismiss it as unworthy of our concern."

The Committee Chairman denied Goldwater's assertion that he (Fulbright) is for "non-intervention" policies.

"The program which I support is one of long-range intervention in depth, one which employs all of the instruments of foreign policy, the political and economic as well as the military," Fulbright said.

There are limitations to foreign policy. We are neither omnipotent nor omniscient, and we cannot aspire to make

the world over in our image. Our proper objective is a continuing effort to limit the world struggle for power and to bring it under civilized rules."